1st November 1932]

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"May I ask whether the Government think that there is any specified time for prayers in the mosque?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"There are five times every day when prayers are conducted in a mosque. The congregation generally know at what time they have to go to the mosque."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"May I ask whether the Government think that prayers are prohibited in the mosque at other times?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Prayers are not prohibited at other times, but the recognized service takes place only at a particular time."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"At the same time, are the Government aware that people continue to say their prayers in the mosque at all hours of the day and even till late in the night?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"One or two people are always there saying their prayers, but the recognized service takes place only at a particular time."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Are the common rights of way such as going in a procession with music along the public streets interfered with only for the sake of old mosque which have been existing for a long time, or are they to be interfered with for the sake of any mosques that have recently come or may come into existence hereafter?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I think these questions are considered on their merits as they arise."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"May I ask whether the Government are aware that this mosque is not a very old mosque?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I am prepared to take the information from the hon. Member."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Two years."

Order, dated 3rd June 1932, under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, issued by the Sub-Magistrate of Jayankondasolapuram, Trichinopoly district.

* 259-A *Q.*—Mr. V. T. ARASU: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the Sub-Magistrate of Jayankondasolapuram in Trichinopoly district has issued on the 3rd June 1932 an order under section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code, prohibiting any kind of meetings and demonstrations in about eleven villages of the Udaiyarpalaiyam zamindari, for a period of two months; and

(*b*) the reason or reasons which prompted the Magistrate to issue that order?

[1st November 1932

A.—(*a*) An order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, was passed but the order prohibited only meetings, demonstrations or propaganda against payment of rent legitimately due to the Udaiyarpalaiyam Zamindar and towards the offering of resistance to the zamin officials in the attachment of properties.

(*b*) A copy[a] of the order of the Stationary Sub-Magistrate, Jayankonda-Cholapuram, dated 3rd June 1932, under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, giving reasons for its promulgation, is laid on the table of the House.

Police

Police help to the Zamindar of Udaiyarpalaiyam.

* 259-B *Q.*—Mr. V. T. Arasu: With reference to question No. 87 answered on 3rd August 1932, will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether the further information, promised to be called for, has been received; and, if so, whether it will be placed on the table of the House?

A.—The information received is as follows:—

From June 1931 there existed a dispute between the Zamindar of Udaiyarpalaiyam and some of his tenants. Persons alleged to be the enemies of the Zamindar are reported to have started a 'no-rent' campaign against him. They held numerous meetings in various villages at which speeches were made advising the ryots not to pay rents to the Zamindar, to molest the collection agents and to intimidate and boycott those tenants who did not abide by their decisions. The feelings between the Zamindar and his tenants became strained, rents were not paid and on the night of the 13th July 1931 a hayrick belonging to the Zamindar was set fire to. As the situation had become serious the District Superintendent of Police visited the locality, made personal enquiries into the matter and had some ring-leaders charged under section 107, Criminal Procedure Code.

2. As a breach of the peace was anticipated, a prohibitory order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, was issued as a result of which the situation became temporarily normal. But certain persons alleged to be the enemies of the Zamindar again started the 'no-rent campaign,' and threatened the zamin officials and patta monigars with acts of violence. The District Magistrate therefore held a conference of all ryots on 17th November 1931 at which the Zamindar was present. The Zamindar announced certain concessions, but the ryots were not

[a] Printed as Appendix VII on page 256 infra.